

Remarks

By the present communication, claim 22 has been amended, and new claims 31-36 have been introduced to define Applicants' invention with greater particularity. No new matter is introduced by the subject amendments as the new and amended claim language is fully supported by the specification and original claims.

In addition, by the present communication, claims 20, 21, 25 and 26 have been canceled without prejudice, subject to Applicants' right to pursue the subject matter thereof in a subsequent filing claiming priority from the present application.

Entry of the amendments submitted herewith is submitted to be proper as the amendments place the application in condition for allowance, or, at a minimum, in better condition for appeal. Accordingly, entry of the amendments submitted herewith is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendments submitted herewith, claims 22-24 and 27-36 will be pending. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented in the **Listing of Claims** starting on page 2, with an appropriate defined status identifier.


Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The rejection of claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, is respectfully traversed, and is not applicable to the presently pending claims.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)Krantz et al.

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Krantz et al., *Biochemistry* (1991) 30(19): 4678-4687, is respectfully traversed, and has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 20 herein. The rejection is not applicable to any of the remaining claims. See, for example, claim 22, which distinguishes over Krantz et al. by requiring a core structure comprising up to 4 amino acid units, with a defined reactive group (RG) at one end thereof, and a defined detectable label (TAG) at the other end thereof, as follows:



wherein:

RG is $-\text{C}(\text{O})-\text{CH}_2-\text{LG}$ (wherein LG is a defined aryloxy or aryl-carboxy leaving group);

TAG is selected from a defined group, and

$n = 0, 1, 2, 3$ or 4 .

Each of the variables associated with the core of the molecule, i.e., R_1 , R_2 and L , are further defined structurally in the claim.

Krantz et al. do not disclose or suggest such compounds. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are respectfully requested.

WO 2003/072528 and Aladekomo et al.

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 2003/072528 and Aladekomo et al., is respectfully traversed, and has been rendered moot by

the cancellation of claim 20 herein. The rejection is not applicable to any of the remaining claims for at least the reasons set forth above.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and favorable action on all claims are respectfully requested. In the event that any matters remain to be resolved in view of this communication, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned so that a prompt disposition of this application can be achieved.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number 30542
Telephone: 858-847-6711
Facsimile: 858-792-6773

By



Stephen E. Reiter
Registration No. 31,192
Attorney for Applicant